

EXHIBIT 5

Albany
Atlanta
Brussels
Denver
Los Angeles

**McKenna Long
& Aldridge**
Attorneys at Law LLP

1900 K Street, NW • Washington, DC 20006-1108
Tel: 202.496.7500 • Fax: 202.496.7756
www.mckennalong.com

New York
Philadelphia
San Diego
San Francisco
Washington, D.C.

CASS W. CHRISTENSON
(202) 496-7218

EMAIL ADDRESS
cchristenson@mckennalong.com

January 30, 2007

VIA E-MAIL AND U.S. MAIL

Scott R. Miller, Esq.
Connolly Bove Lodge & Hutz, LLP
355 South Grand Avenue, Suite 3150
Los Angeles, CA 90071

Frank E. Merideth, Jr., Esq.
Greenberg Traurig, LLP
2450 Colorado Avenue, Suite 400 East
Santa Monica, CA 90404

Re: LG.Philips LCD Co., Ltd. v. Tatung, et al.; Civil Action No. 04-343 (JJF)

Dear Scott and Frank:

I write to respond to your recent letters and emails concerning deposition scheduling for defendants' witnesses. Yesterday, Frank and I discussed these issues concerning Tatung and Tatung America. Unfortunately, Scott again declined to discuss these issues with me by phone despite my efforts to speak with him.

With respect to LPL's depositions, we are in receipt of the new deposition notices for the inventors. As Frank and I discussed yesterday, LPL's witnesses will be deposed in Washington, D.C. and defendants' witnesses will be deposed in McKenna Long & Aldridge LLP's Los Angeles office. Accordingly, we assume that the Delaware location in ViewSonic's recent deposition notices directed to LPL is moot. As previously noted, we expect that LPL's depositions will begin in late February in Washington. As you already know, however, and as the parties have raised with the Special Master, we disagree concerning the amount of time for which the inventors may be deposed in this case. We also received today deposition notices for separate Rule 30(b)(6) depositions of LPL. As we have previously discussed, we intend to produce witnesses once, not multiple times. Accordingly, we oppose any new effort to take separate Rule 30(b)(6) depositions. We also object to the separate, arbitrary dates in the deposition notices.

Scott R. Miller, Esq.
Frank E. Merideth, Jr., Esq.
January 30, 2007
Page 2

My understanding is that the defendants each have agreed to begin producing witnesses promptly, and before LPL's depositions begin. We intend to depose witnesses on consecutive dates to the extent possible, thus reducing the number of trips required for the depositions. Because different attorneys will be involved for the technical depositions and other depositions of defendants' witnesses, we would like to schedule the depositions so that technical witnesses are grouped together and other witnesses are grouped together. We also intend to depose Rule 30(b)(6) designees after we have deposed witnesses who are testifying only in an individual capacity. Further, we need to receive the outstanding discovery that LPL is seeking so that we can prepare for and complete the depositions. Given our approaching March 30 deadline, we need to begin depositions as soon as possible, and to receive all additional documents and things as soon as possible and well in advance of the defendants' depositions.

Frank confirmed yesterday that Tatung America's witnesses can be deposed in February (specifically including, for example, the week of February 19). Frank also informed me yesterday that Tatung prefers to begin depositions after March 1, as February 28 is a national holiday in Taiwan (Taiwan National Day). We discussed the possibility of deposing some of Tatung's witnesses the week of March 5 and then completing remaining Tatung depositions later. Although we did not reach any agreements concerning dates for Tatung's depositions yesterday, our discussion was a starting point. As I explained to Frank, however, we need to reach a global schedule for all depositions and, therefore, we need to know ViewSonic's witness availability. We hope we can resolve the schedule with you. If not, we intend to pursue our pending motion to compel depositions as proposed. With respect to our proposed deposition schedule (Appendix A to LPL's January 26 motion to compel) Scott stated yesterday that Ms. Wang is not available on February 20 and "several other" unspecified dates "are problematic." ViewSonic has not yet proposed any alternative dates or addressed availability concerning other proposed dates.

Please let us know as soon as possible whether Tatung, Tatung America, and ViewSonic would be interested in depositions the following weeks, which we are circulating for discussion purposes and subject to our pending motion to compel depositions and schedule:

Week of February 19

Depositions of Bryan Lin, Sally Wang, Andrew Sun, Vivian Liu, and Robert Ranucci. We understand that Andrew Sun will testify as one of the two Tatung America Rule 30(b)(6) designees and that Sally Wang, Bryan Lin, Vivian Liu, and Robert Ranucci will not testify as Rule 30(b)(6) designees. LPL requests immediate notification if any of these witnesses will require interpreters and if LPL's understanding concerning Rule 30(b)(6) designees is incorrect.

Week of March 5

Depositions of Kevin Ho, Jackson Chang, Hsi-Ling (Jamie) Yang, S.Y. Tsai, and Huang Chin-min. We understand that none of these witnesses will testify as Rule 30(b)(6) designees.

Scott R. Miller, Esq.
Frank E. Merideth, Jr., Esq.
January 30, 2007
Page 3

LPL requests immediate notification if any of these witnesses will require interpreters and if LPL's understanding concerning Rule 30(b)(6) designees is incorrect.

Week of March 26

Depositions of Peter Farzin, Oliver Shih, Tsyr-Huey (Vincent) Liu, Jeff Volpe, and Tommy Jue. We understand that Peter Farzin will testify as one of the two Tatung America Rule 30(b)(6) designees, that Oliver Shih and Tsyr-Huey (Vincent) Liu will testify as Tatung's only Rule 30(b)(6) designees and that Jeff Volpe and Tommy Jue will testify as ViewSonic's only Rule 30(b)(6) designees. LPL requests immediate notification if any of these witnesses will require interpreters and if LPL's understanding concerning Rule 30(b)(6) designees is incorrect.

We provide this potential scheduling approach to facilitate our discussions and to continue LPL's efforts to resolve our dispute on deposition scheduling. Please respond as soon as possible.

Very truly yours,



Cass W. Christenson

CWC:ea

cc: Richard D. Kirk, Esq. (via e-mail)
Mark Krietzman, Esq. (via e-mail)
Valerie W. Ho, Esq. (via e-mail)
Jong P. Hong, Esq. (via e-mail)
Steve P. Hassid, Esq. (via e-mail)
Anne Shea Gaza, Esq. (via e-mail)
Frederick L. Cottrell, III, Esq. (via e-mail)
Manuel Nelson, Esq. (via e-mail)
Tracy R. Roman, Esq. (via e-mail)
Jeffrey B. Bove, Esq. (via e-mail)
Jaclyn M. Mason, Esq. (via e-mail)